

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE           | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 09/618,165  | 07/17/2000            | Jae Beom Choi        | 8733.039.20           | 8415             |
| 30827 7590 01/30/2007<br>MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP<br>1900 K STREET, NW |                       |                      | EXAMINER              |                  |
|   |                       |                      | BOUTSIKARIS, LEONIDAS |                  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20006  |                       |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                       |                      | 2872                  |                  |
|   |                       |                      |                       |                  |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR  | RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE         |                  |
| 3 MONTHS  |                       | 01/30/2007           | PAPER                 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | 09/618,165  | CHOI ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Leo Boutsikaris   | 2872  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N.<br>nely filed<br>the mailing date of this communication.<br>D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 No.  | ovember 2006.   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | action is non-final.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is  |   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) 3-5,7-11,13-15,17-23 and 27-37 is/are pending in the application.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-5,7-11,13-15 and 17-23</u> is/are rejected.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2000 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex  | aminer. Note the attached Office  | e Action or form PTO-152.   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:   | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a  | )-(d) or (f).   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/084,583.  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| ,  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) 🔲 Interview Summary  | ·<br>(PTO-413)  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail D  | ate   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   | 5)  | Patent Application  |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | ٠/ <u>ـــــــ</u> .   |   |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 09/618,165

Art Unit: 2872

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota (US 3,912,920) in view of Melles-Griot Optics Catalog (Optics Guide 5).

Regarding claim 8, Kubota discloses a polarizer structure (Fig. 2) comprising a plurality of sections such as 31 and 32, each section comprising a plurality of transparent substrates 3a made of glass and producing polarized light (Fig. 1, lines 18-29, col. 2, lines 42-51, col. 3). However, Kubota does not disclose explicitly that the transparent substrates 3a causing the polarization of the incident light are made from quartz. Kubota does teach that polarization occurs when light strikes obliquely the plane of a transparent substance such as a glass plate (lines 42-58, col. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use quartz plates instead glass plates in the polarizer structure of Kubota, since quartz is similar to glass and it is less susceptible to external deleterious factors. Regarding the limitation that the polarizer structure comprises a holder supporting the plurality of the polarizer sections, it is noted that it is inherent that the device of Kubota shown in Fig. 2 includes a holder to support the polarizer sheet.

Art Unit: 2872

Furthermore, it is inherent that the polarizer holder includes a light absorptive material, since any material, which is not a perfect reflector absorbs incident light. However, Kubota does not specify the amount of optical absorptivity exhibited by the polarizer holder. The Melles Griot Optics product catalog (Optics Guide 5) shows polarizer elements (e.g., sheet polarizers), wherein it is disclosed that said polarizers are mounted on holders comprising black metal ring (see p. 14-23). In the special section dedicated to mounting systems, the catalog shows a lens holder made from brass, wherein it is taught that the body is black chrome coated to reduce scatter and stray reflections (see p. 23-5). For illustration purposes only, several other product publications are recited, all of them disclosing polarizer holders made of black anodized metal (see OptoSigma, Standa, and EKSPLA catalogs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the material of the polarizer holder of Kubota having a high absorptivity (such as highly absorbing black surfaced material), as taught by the Melles-Griot catalog, for avoiding undesired scattering of light (as taught by Melles-Griot) into the (narrow-angle forward, p-polarized) light component at the output of the device. Regarding the claimed amount of absorptivity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the material of the polarizer holder of Kubota having an absorptivity almost equal to 100%, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The use of highly absorptive optical element holders is well known in the art for preventing deleterious light scattering and reflection effects, which may adversely affect the optical beam quality.

Regarding claims 3, 5, 13, 15, the glass polarizer sections are rectangular.

Application/Control Number: 09/618,165 Page 4

Art Unit: 2872

Regarding claims 7, 17, each section 31 comprises a plurality of glass substrates 3a (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 9-10, 20-21, the plurality of the glass substrate parts is placed at a non-zero angle equal to the Brewster's angle relative to the normal line to the surface of the polarizer (lines 43-49, col. 1).

Regarding claims 11, 22, the device of Kubota further includes a light source 1 for generating light, and means 2 for directing light onto the polarizer sheet (Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 4, 14, Kubota does not specify that the sections 31 or 32 are triangular in shape. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the polarizer section triangular, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Here, the result effective variable is the shape of the polarizer. A mesh of triangular shaped sections is more economical to make since it has fewer connecting edges.

Regarding claim 18, the means 2 for directing the light incident on the polarizer collimates the light (see Figs. 1-2, and lines 47-49, col. 2).

Regarding claim 19, the stack of glass substrates 31 partially polarizes the incident light (lines 51-57, col. 2).

Regarding claim 23, the degree of partial polarization depends on the number of glass substrates 3a stacked on top of one another (lines 26-34, col. 3).

### Response to Applicant's Arguments

Application/Control Number: 09/618,165

Art Unit: 2872

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8, 11, 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Leo Boutsikaris whose telephone number is 571-272-2308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephone Allen can be reached on 571-272-2434. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/618,165

Art Unit: 2872

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Page 6

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leo Boutsikaris, Ph.D., Esq.

Primary Patent Examiner, AU 2872

January 25, 2007

**LEONIDAS BOUTSIKARIS** PRIMARY EXAMINER